THE HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO: 10731 of 2004

Dated: 25-07-2006

Between:

APSRTC., rep., by its
Managing Director,
Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The State Transport Appellate Tribunal,
Rep., by its Presiding Officer,
Nampally, Hyderabad and two others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO: 10731 of 2004

O R D E R:

Heard both sides.

This writ petition is filed by the Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation questioning the order of the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad (for short, the Tribunal), dated 17-03-2003 made in R.P.No.107 of 1996, which was filed against the order dated 23-09-1996 passed by the Regional Transport Authority, Cuddapah, whereunder the application of the third respondent for grant of stage carriage permit to ply on the town service route – Jammalamadugu old bus stand to Mylavaram Residential School via Veparala Cross roads, was rejected.

It is to be noted that R.P.No.107 of 1996 was allowed following the Full Bench decision of this Court in *APSRTC v. State Transport Appellate Tribunal*[1], whereunder it was held that there was no prohibition for grant of permits to ply town services though the route in question overlaps on the notified mufussil route.

When the matter is taken up for consideration, it is brought to my notice by the learned counsel for both the parties that during the pendency of this writ petition, a Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court in *APSRTC v. Regional Transport Authority and another*[2], reversed the said decision of the Full Bench of this

Court holding that under Exception 2 contained in the Note appended to the Scheme permits can be issued only to the existing town services operating in the notified routes which means only existing operators on the notified routes are eligible for permits and fresh applicants or future applicants are totally ineligible for granting permits for town services operating on notified routes.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that since the revision petition was allowed by the Tribunal without going into the merits of the case, the matter requires reconsideration on merits. The learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the same. It is stated that as a matter of fact, a batch of writ petitions have already been disposed of remanding the matters to the Tribunal for consideration afresh.

Accordingly the impugned order dated 17-03-2003 made in R.P.No.107 of 1996 by the Appellate Tribunal is set aside and the writ petition is allowed remanding the matter to the Appellate Tribunal for consideration afresh on merits and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law after hearing both sides as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Till such time, *status quo,* obtaining as on today as to the route in question, shall be maintained. No costs.

_____

G. ROHINI, J

Dated: 25-07-2006
KLP

[1] 2001 (2) ALT 532 (FB)

[2] (2005) 4 SCC 391